

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 1, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 3, 10 and 17 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-16 and 18 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 3, 10 and 17 are objected to by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, and 17 have been amended. Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publish Application No. 2002/0039089 to Lim (hereinafter "Lim"). Claims 6, 8, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 966, 115 to Aoki (hereinafter "Aoki").

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lim is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Lim does not disclose either explicitly or inherently, each and every element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of elements including "a plurality of conductive lines formed at an outer side of the image display part on the first substrate to supply gate driving signals to the gate driving integrated circuits to be supplied to the gate lines" Applicants submit that Lim does not disclose at least the quoted combination of features recited in claim 1.

The Examiner in rejecting claim 1 cites paragraphs [0013] and [0016] of Lim as teaching the above quoted combination of features. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion with respect to the disclosure of Lim. Applicants submit no part of Lim including the paragraphs cited by the Examiner discloses a plurality of control lines arranged as recited in claim 1. For example, paragraph [0013] states in part "Tape carrier packages (TCPs) 1 and 4 are attached to pads of the gate lines G1, G2... Gm, and the data lines D1, D2...Dn of the liquid crystal display panel 8 respectively. The TCPs 1 and 4 have mounted thereon integrated circuits (IC's) 2 and 3." Applicants submit that there is no disclosure in Lim of control lines supplying

ICs 2 and 3 arranged and located as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Lim does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants note that claims 2 and 4 each depends from claim 1 and each includes by reference all of the limitations of 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 4 are not anticipated by Lim for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claim 5 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display device having a combination of elements including “providing a plurality of conductive lines at an outer side of an image display part of a first substrate for to supply gate driving signals to the gate driving integrated circuits to be supplied to the gate lines.” Applicants submit that Lim does not disclose expressly or inherently the quoted combination of features recited in claim 5 for reasons identical to those given for claim 1. Accordingly Applicants submit that Lim does not anticipate claim 5.

Applicants note that claims 7 and 11 each depends from claim 5 and each includes by reference all of the limitations of 5. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 11 are not anticipated by Lim for at least the reasons given for claim 5.

Claim 12 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display device having a combination of elements including “a plurality of conductive lines mounted on an outer side of the image display part of the first substrate to supply gate driving signals to the gate driving integrated circuits to be supplied to the gate lines”. Applicants submit that Lim does not disclose expressly or inherently the quoted combination of features recited in claim 12 for reasons identical to those given for claim 1. Accordingly Applicants submit that Lim does not anticipate claim 12.

Applicants note that claims 14, 16, and 18 each depends from claim 12 and each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 14, 16, and 18 are not anticipated by Lim for at least the reasons given for claim 5.

The rejection of claims 6, 8, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view Aoki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Lim and Aoki do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Applicants note that claims 6 and 8 each depend from claim 5 and each includes by reference all of the elements of claim 5. As Applicants have discussed above Lim does not anticipate claim 5. The Examiner cites Aoki as curing the deficiencies of Lim with respect to

“an image produced by supplying the first control signal is inverted”. Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusion with respect to the teachings of Aoki. Applicants contend that Aoki does not cure the deficiencies of Lim with respect to claim 5. Applicants submit that Lim and Aoki, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 and claims 6 and 8 depending from claim 5 are allowable over Lim and Aoki.

With respect to claims 13 and 15, Applicants note that claims 13 and 15 each depend from claim 12 and each includes by reference all of the elements of claim 12. As Applicants have discussed above Lim does not anticipate claim 12. The Examiner cites Aoki as curing the deficiencies of Lim with respect to “an image produced by supplying the first control signal is inverted”. Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusion with respect to the teachings of Aoki. Applicants contend that Aoki does not cure the deficiencies of Lim with respect to claim 12. Applicants submit that Lim and Aoki, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 and claims 13 and 15 depending from claim 12 are allowable over Lim and Aoki.

The objection to claims 3, 10 and 17 as being allowable but dependent on rejected base claims is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As the Applicants have presented above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Lim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 3 depends from an allowable base claim and respectfully request that the objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 17 have been rewritten into independent form reciting all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 17 are allowable and request that the objection to claims 10 and 17 be withdrawn.

The Abstract is objected to as being longer than 150 words. With this response, a new Abstract shorter in length than 150 words is provided. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 1, 2006

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53605
for **Rebecca G. Rudich**
Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants